arXiv:1512.01708v1 [cs.LG] 5 Dec 2015

Variance Reduction for Distributed Stochastic Gradient Descent

Soham De
Department of Computer Science
University of Maryland, College Park
sohamde@cs.umd.edu

Gavin Taylor
United States Naval Academy
taylor@usna.edu

Tom Goldstein
Department of Computer Science
University of Maryland, College Park
tomg@cs.umd.edu

Abstract

Variance reduction (VR) methods boost the performance of stochastic gradient descent (SGD) by enabling the use of larger stepsizes and preserving linear convergence rates. However, current variance reduced SGD methods require either high memory usage or require a full pass over the (large) data set at the end of each epoch to calculate the exact gradient of the objective function. This makes current VR methods impractical in distributed or parallel settings. In this paper, we propose a variance reduction method, called *VR-lite*, that does not require full gradient computations or extra storage. We explore distributed synchronous and asynchronous variants with both high and low communication latency. We find that our distributed algorithms scale linearly with the number of local workers and remain stable even with low communication frequency. We empirically compare both the sequential and distributed algorithms to state-of-the-art stochastic optimization methods, and find that our proposed algorithms consistently converge faster than other stochastic methods.

1 Introduction

Many problems in machine learning and statistics involve minimizations of the form

$$\min_x f(x), \quad f(x) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x), \tag{1}$$

where each $f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. Problems of this form include logistic regression, support vector machines, matrix factorization, and others [13]. Such problems frequently arise when fitting a model to data, where each f_i measures how well a model fits a particular data point. For example, if $\{a_i\}$ is a collection of feature vectors and $\{b_i\}$ is a collection of model outputs, a simple least-squares regression is obtained by setting $f_i(x) = (a_i^T x - b_i)^2$.

When large datasets are involved, problems of the form (1) are traditionally solved using stochastic gradient descent (SGD) updates of the form

$$x^{k+1} = x^k - \eta^k g^k,$$

where i_k is a randomly chosen index, $g^k = \nabla f_{i_k}(x) \approx \nabla f(x^k)$ is a "noisy" gradient estimate, and η^k is a stepsize parameter. This crude approximate gradient is inexpensive and highly effective when the error is large, resulting in fast convergence to low accuracy solutions. Unfortunately, as the iterates approach the true solution, the gradient descent stepsize must vanish ($\eta_k \leq (1/\sqrt{k})$) to dampen the effects of noise, resulting is extremely slow convergence in the high accuracy regime.

Variance reduction (VR) schemes [7, 5, 14, 16, 6, 8, 9, 19, 18] are able to maintain a large constant stepsize and achieve fast convergence to high accuracy. While the difference between the stochastic and exact gradient is potentially large, this difference is predictable – the gradient errors are highly correlated between different uses of the same function f_{i_k}.

VR methods exploit this property by approximating the gradient error at the most recent use of f_{i_k}, and subtracting this error from $\nabla f_{i_k}(x^k)$ to obtain a more accurate solution. This results in approximate gradients of the form

$$g^k = \underbrace{\nabla f_{i_k}(x)}_{\text{approximate gradient}} - \underbrace{\nabla f_{i_k}(y) + \widetilde{g_y}}_{\text{error correction term}}, \tag{2}$$

where y is an old iterate, and $\widetilde{g}_y$ is an approximation of the true gradient $\nabla f(y)$. The algorithm SVRG [7], for

Preprint.

example, sets y to be an iterate from the algorithm history and sets $\widetilde{g}_y = \nabla f(y)$ to be the exact gradient at y. The more recent SAGA scheme [5] stores the most recent value of ∇f_i (for all i) and chooses $\widetilde{g}_y$ to be the average of these values. This error correction term in (2) allows VR methods to use large (non-vanishing) stepsizes, preserve linear convergence rates (under strong convexity assumptions), and significantly outperform classical stochastic gradient descent (SGD) [15].

Current VR methods suffer from several caveats that degrade performance. First, some methods (e.g., SAGA) require storing a complete history of n previous iterates, thus significantly increasing memory requirements (although this requirement can be mitigated for some simple minimization problems [5]). Other methods (e.g., SVRG) require computation of the exact gradient ∇f over the entire dataset after each epoch, effectively doubling the cost of each epoch. This cost is often significant in real-world scenarios where SGD methods typically converge after relatively few epochs.

Another caveat of VR algorithms is that they have not been adequately studied in the distributed setting. For large-scale problems, asynchronous variants of distributed SGD are still widely used [4, 13, 1, 11, 17, 10, 3, 21, 20]. Most of the work in this line of research has been focused on the parameter server model of computation [4, 13, 10, 1, 11], where updates are immediately communicated to the central server. Relatively little work has been done in the truly distributed case where communications costs are high [21, 20]. Algorithms that lower the frequency of communication for SGD-type methods usually lead to slower convergence and sometimes instability, a problem that could be mitigated using VR.

1.1 Contributions

This work has two main contributions. First, we present a new approach to VR, *VR-lite*, that requires neither extra memory to store algorithm history, nor the computation of exact gradients. For this reason, *VR-lite* has lower memory requirements and faster iterations than previous approaches. This is achieved by storing averages of previous iterates rather than a complete history. We analyze the convergence of our method, and show empirically that this approach converges much faster than competing methods.

Next, we study the application of *VR-lite* in a distributed setting. We present asynchronous variants of *VR-lite* on a parameter server model of computation, and both synchronous and asynchronous variants in a fully distributed setting (i.e., with long communication periods between nodes). Additionally, we find that our algorithms, in the fully distributed case, scale linearly with the number of workers (for experiments with up to 10 local workers), and remain stable even for high communication periods, while comparing favorably to state-of-the-art SGD methods for classification and regression tasks.

2 Proposed Algorithm: VR-lite

Most VR schemes are divided into epochs, during which a pass is made over the entire dataset. Thus, n updates take place during the mth epoch (one update per data record/feature vector). The iterates generated in the mth epoch can be written $\{x_m^j\}_{j=1}^n$.

At the end of an epoch, the SVRG method sets $y = x_m^n$, and $\widetilde{g}_y$ to the exact gradient $\nabla f(y) = \sum_j \nabla f_j(x_m^n)$. These values of y and $\widetilde{g}_y$ are then used to perform corrected gradient updates of the form (2). This approach avoids the extra memory requirements of "epoch-free algorithms" such as [5], but requires an expensive gradient evaluation over the entire dataset on each iteration.

To speed computation, *VR-lite* accumulates the *average* gradient vector over an epoch. This average gradient is then used as $\widetilde{g}_y$, thus avoiding costly loops over the entire (large) dataset. These accumulated averages can be computed cheaply "on the fly" as the algorithm runs without noticeable overhead.

Let π_m denote a random permutation of the data indices $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$, with π_m^j denoting the data index chosen in the j-th step in π_m. Then, the update rule for our algorithm is given by

$$x_{m+1}^{k+1} = x_{m+1}^k - \eta\big(\nabla f_{i_k}(x_{m+1}^k) - \nabla f_{i_k}(\overline{x}_m) + \overline{g}_m\big), \quad (3)$$

where $i_k = \pi_{m+1}^k$. $\overline{x}_m$ and $\overline{g}_m$ are defined as

$$\overline{x}_m = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n x_m^j, \text{ and } \overline{g}_m = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j), \quad (4)$$

and denote the average over iterations and gradients, respectively. The values of $\overline{x}_0$ and $\overline{g}_0$ are initialized using a single epoch of vanilla SGD with no VR correction. This algorithm fits into the general framework (2) with $y = \overline{x}_m$ and $\widetilde{g}_y = \overline{g}_m$, does not require any extra storage apart from a place to store and update these averages, and only requires 2 gradient computations per epoch. The full method is described in Algorithm 1.

3 Convergence Analysis

We now present convergence bounds for Algorithm 1. We make the following standard assumptions about

Algorithm 1 VR-lite Algorithm

parameters learning rate η
initialize x, $\overline{x}$, and $\overline{g}$ using plain SGD
while not converged **do**
  $\widetilde{x} = \widetilde{g} = 0$
  for k in $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ **do**
    sample $i_k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ without replacement
    $x \leftarrow x - \eta\big(\nabla f_{i_j}(x) - \nabla f_{i_j}(\overline{x}) + \overline{g}\big)$
    $\widetilde{x} \leftarrow \widetilde{x} + x$, $\widetilde{g} \leftarrow \widetilde{g} + \nabla f_{i_j}(x)$
  end for
  $\overline{x} = \widetilde{x}/n$, $\overline{g} = \widetilde{g}/n$
end while

the function when studying convergence properties. First, f_i are strongly convex with strong convexity constant μ:

$$f_i(x) \geq f_i(y) + \nabla f_i(y)^T(x-y) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x-y\|^2. \quad (5)$$

Setting $y = x^\star$, the optimal solution, and using the fact that $\nabla f(x^\star) = 0$ yields $f_i(x) - f_i(x^\star) \geq \frac{\mu}{2}\|x - x^\star\|^2$. Summing over all f_i, we get $f(x) - f(x^\star) \geq \frac{\mu}{2}\|x - x^\star\|^2$.

Each f_i has Lipschitz continuous gradients with Lipschitz constant L so that

$$f_i(x) \leq f_i(y) + \nabla f_i(y)^T(x-y) + \frac{L}{2}\|x-y\|^2. \quad (6)$$

Before presenting our main theorem, we start with a trivial lemma commonly used in variance reduction theory [7, 5] and elsewhere.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $\{f_i\}$ are convex and Lipschitz smooth. For any x^* and $\{x_i\}$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_i \|\nabla f_i(x_i) - \nabla f_i(x^\star)\|^2 \leq \frac{2L}{n}\sum_i f(x_i) - f(x^\star) - \langle \nabla f_i(x^\star), x_i - x^\star\rangle.$$

Proof. This follows immediately from (6). □

We now state our main convergence result. For the analysis, we assume that data indices are chosen uniformly at random (i.e., with replacement).

Theorem 1. *Consider the minimization of a function (1) satisfying properties (5) and (6). Consider the iterates generated by Algorithm 1. Let*

$$\alpha = (2 + 2nL\eta(2\mu\eta + 2L\eta + 3\mu + 3L)),$$
$$\beta = 2\eta(\mu - 4L\eta - 1),$$

and assume n and μ are sufficiently large and η is sufficiently small such that $\beta > 0$ and $\alpha/(n\beta) < 1$. Then we have the following linear convergence bound:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_{m+1})} - f(x^\star)\Big] \leq \frac{\alpha}{n\beta}\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big] + \frac{\mu\eta(4\eta+3)}{\beta}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big],$$

where $\overline{f(x_m)} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_j f(x_m^j)$ denotes the average of the function values over the m-th epoch.

Proof. Let $v_{m+1}^k = \nabla f_{i_k}(x_{m+1}^k) - \nabla f_{i_k}(\bar{x}_m) + \overline{g}_m$. So the update rule in (3) can be written as

$$x_{m+1}^{k+1} = x_{m+1}^k - \eta v_{m+1}^k. \quad (7)$$

All expectations are taken with respect to i_k and conditioned on x_{m+1}^k, unless stated otherwise. The expected value of v_{m+1}^k is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[v_{m+1}^k] = \nabla f(x_{m+1}^k) - \nabla f(\bar{x}_m) + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j),$$

where i_j denotes the random choice of the data index in the j-th iteration of the epoch. We first bound the expected value of $\|v_{m+1}^k\|$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|v_{m+1}^k\big\|^2\Big] &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|\nabla f_{i_k}(x_{m+1}^k) - \nabla f_{i_k}(x^\star) \\
&\quad + \nabla f_{i_k}(x^\star) - \nabla f_{i_k}(\bar{x}_m) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\big\|^2\Big] \\
&\leq 4\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|\nabla f_{i_k}(x_{m+1}^k) - \nabla f_{i_k}(x^\star)\big\|^2\Big] \\
&\quad + 4\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\|\nabla f_{i_k}(\bar{x}_m) - \nabla f_{i_k}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big] \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \big\|\nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\big\|^2 \\
&\quad + 4\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2 \\
&\leq 8L\Big(f(x_{m+1}^k) - f(x^\star)\Big) + 8L\Big(f(\bar{x}_m) - f(x^\star)\Big) \\
&\quad + \frac{4}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \big\|\nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\big\|^2 \\
&\quad + 4\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2. \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. The second inequality uses Lemma 1. From Jensen's inequality we know $f(\bar{x}_m) \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n f(x_m^j)$. Also, we have

$$\Big\|\nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2 \leq L^2\Big\|x_m^j - x^\star\Big\|^2$$

$$\leq \frac{2L^2}{\mu}\big(f(x_m^j) - f(x^\star)\big). \quad (9)$$

Applying these observations to (8) and writing $\overline{f(x_m)} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n f_{i_j}(x_m^j)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|v_{m+1}^k\big\|^2\Big] \leq\ & 8L\Big(f(x_{m+1}^k) - f(x^\star)\Big) \\ & + (8L + 8L^2/\mu)\Big(\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big) \\ & + 4\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We now bound the expected value of $\|x_{m+1}^{k+1} - x^\star\|^2$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|x_{m+1}^{k+1} - x^\star\big\|^2\Big] = \big\|x_{m+1}^k - x^\star\big\|^2 \\ &\quad - 2\eta\big(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star\big)^T\mathbb{E}\big[v_{m+1}^k\big] + \eta^2\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|v_{m+1}^k\big\|^2\Big] \\ &= \big\|x_{m+1}^k - x^\star\big\|^2 - 2\eta\big(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star\big)^T\nabla f(x_{m+1}^k) \\ &- 2\eta\big(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star\big)^T\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \nabla f(\bar{x}_m)\Big) \\ &\quad + \eta^2\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|v_{m+1}^k\big\|^2\Big] \\ &\leq \big\|x_{m+1}^k - x^\star\big\|^2 - 2\eta\big(f(x_{m+1}^k) - f(x^\star)\big) \\ &\ + 8\eta^2 L\Big(f(x_{m+1}^k) - f(x^\star)\Big) \\ &+ \eta^2(8L + 8L^2/\mu)\Big(\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big) \\ &+ 4\eta^2\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2 \\ &- 2\eta\big(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star\big)^T\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \nabla f(\bar{x}_m)\Big). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The first inequality uses the property of convexity of the function f: $(x - x^\star)^T\nabla f(x) \geq f(x) - f(x^\star)$. The second inequality just uses equation (10).

Taking expectation on all history and summing (11) over all k in the $(m+1)$-th epoch, we get a telescoping sum. Canceling out appropriate terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|x_{m+2}^0 - x^\star\big\|^2\Big] + n(2\eta - 8L\eta^2)\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_{m+1})} - f(x^\star)\Big] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|x_{m+1}^0 - x^\star\big\|^2\Big] + 4n\eta^2\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big] \\ &\quad + n\eta^2(8L + 8L^2/\mu)\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big] \\ &- 2\eta n\mathbb{E}\Big[\big(\bar{x}_{m+1} - x^\star\big)^T\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \nabla f(\bar{x}_m)\Big)\Big]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

We now bound the remaining inner product term:

$$\begin{aligned}&-2\mathbb{E}\Big[\big(\bar{x}_{m+1} - x^\star\big)^T\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \nabla f(\bar{x}_m)\Big)\Big] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|\bar{x}_{m+1} - x^\star\big\|\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \nabla f_{i_j}(\bar{x}_m)\Big\|\Big] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|\bar{x}_{m+1} - x^\star\big\|^2 + \Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \nabla f_{i_j}(\bar{x}_m)\Big\|^2\Big] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|\bar{x}_{m+1} - x^\star\big\|^2 + 3\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x_m^j) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2 \\ &\quad + 3\big\|\nabla f(\bar{x}_m) - \nabla f(x^\star)\big\|^2 + 3\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{2}{\mu}\big(f(\bar{x}_{m+1}) - f(x^\star)\big) + \frac{6L^2}{\mu}\big(\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\big) \\ &\quad + 6L\big(f(\bar{x}_m) - f(x^\star)\big) + 3\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big] \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\mu}\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_{m+1})} - f(x^\star)\Big] + (6L + 6L^2/\mu)\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big] \\ &\quad + 3\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big]. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The first and third inequalities follow from Cauchy-Schwartz. The second inequality uses the property: $a^2 + b^2 \geq 2ab$. The fourth inequality uses the strong convexity property of f, Lemma 1, and equation (9). The fifth inequality uses Jensen's inequality. We also note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|x_{m+1}^0 - x^\star\big\|^2\Big] \leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|x_m^j - x^\star\big\|^2\Big] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{2}{\mu}\mathbb{E}\Big[f(x_m^j) - f(x^\star)\Big] = \frac{2}{\mu}\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the last inequality and equation (13) to equation (12) yields

$$\begin{aligned}&n\eta(2 - 8L\eta - 2/\mu)\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_{m+1})} - f(x^\star)\Big] \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\mu}(1 + nL\eta(2\mu\eta + 2L\eta + 3\mu + 3L))\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big] \\ &+ n\eta(4\eta + 3)\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big]. \end{aligned}$$

The result immediately follows.

Remark: Theorem (1) shows that *VR-lite* decreases the objective linearly (in expectation), up to an error term proportional to $\eta\mathbb{E}\big[\big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\big\|^2\big]$.

Note that $\mathbb{E}\big[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\big] = 0$, and so this error term scales with $\frac{\eta}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\big[\big\|\nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\big\|^2\big]$, and vanishes for large n or small η. In practice, we select indices using a random permutation (i.e. without replacement), thus guaranteeing that $\big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\big\|^2 = \big\|\nabla f(x^\star)\big\|^2 = 0$. Despite these technicalities, we have found the convergence of the algorithm to be very reliable in practice, regardless of the values of η and n, or the sample strategy used.

□

4 Distributed Algorithms

We now consider a setting where the data is distributed across p local nodes, and our objective is to minimize the global objective function. Let the set of data indices $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ be decomposed into disjoint subsets $\{\Omega_s\}$, with each Ω_s representing the indices of data stored of server s. The objective (1) now has the form

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{s=1}^{p}\sum_{j\in\Omega_s} f_j(x).$$

We also consider a centralized setting, i.e., each local node can only communicate with a central node.

VR-lite, presented in Section 2, is easily distributed in an asynchronous manner since it does not involve calculating the full gradient of the objective function as in SVRG. Moreover, since the algorithm needs to update the average of the gradients only at the end of an epoch, communication periods between the central node and the local nodes can be increased while still ensuring a fast and stable algorithm.

In this section, we consider distributed implementations of *VR-lite*. In Section 4.1 we propose an asynchronous variant of *VR-lite* using a "parameter server" model, with theoretical guarantees. In Section 4.2, we propose synchronous and asynchronous variants where we avoid the communication bottlenecks in the "parameter server" model.

4.1 Parameter Server Model

In a parameter server model of computation, a central server maintains global variables, and each local client node makes updates to the centrally stored global variables using its own communication channel. An asynchronous variation of *VR-lite* for the parameter server, *ParamServ VR-lite* is presented in Algorithm 2.

Each local node reads in the current x and $\overline{x}$ from the central server, calculates an approximate VR gradient, and then updates the central parameters using update (3). Once a local node completes an epoch of its local data, it sends the *change* in the local averages $\bar{x}_s$ and $\bar{g}_s$ over the last local epoch to the central server. This change is added to global $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{g}$ to update the global averages. This ensures the central $\overline{x}$ and $\overline{g}$ always store unbiased estimates of the average of the distributed mean $\{\bar{x}_s\}$ and $\{\bar{g}_s\}$.

In practice, we noticed that best results are obtained if we enforce a synchronization step after some number of local epochs so that the slowest running node can catch up to the fastest running node. In Section 4.2 we present more stable variations of *VR-lite* which avoid this limitation, leading to a truly asynchronous algorithm. In the next sub-section, we prove convergence for *ParamServ VR-lite* where we enforce periodic synchronization after a complete epoch. This is the same setting of synchronization used in the Section 5 to test performance of this algorithm.

Algorithm 2 ParamServ VR-lite Algorithm

parameters learning rate η,
  data decomposition $\{\Omega_s\}$
initialize x, $\overline{x}$, $\overline{g}$, $\alpha = 1/p$, $\overline{x}_{\text{old}} = \overline{g}_{\text{old}} = 0$
while not converged **do**
  for each local client s **do**
    $\widetilde{x} = \widetilde{g} = 0$
    for k in $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ **do**
      Read x and $\overline{x}$ from central server
      Sample $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ without replacement
      Send $\nabla f_i(x)$ and $\nabla f_i(\overline{x})$ to central node
      $\widetilde{x} \leftarrow \widetilde{x} + x$, $\widetilde{g} \leftarrow \widetilde{g} + \nabla f_i(x)$
    end for
    $\bar{x}_s \leftarrow \widetilde{x}/n$, $\bar{g}_s \leftarrow \widetilde{g}/n$
    $\Delta\overline{x}_s \leftarrow \bar{x}_s - \overline{x}_{\text{old}}$, $\Delta\overline{g}_s \leftarrow \bar{g}_s - \overline{g}_{\text{old}}$
    $\overline{x}_{\text{old}} \leftarrow \widetilde{x}$, $\overline{g}_{\text{old}} \leftarrow \widetilde{g}$
    send $\Delta\overline{x}_s$, $\Delta\overline{g}_s$ to central node
  end for
  if central node **then**
    receive $\nabla f_i(x)$ and $\nabla f_i(\overline{x})$ from a local worker
    $x \leftarrow x - \eta(\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(\overline{x}) + \overline{g})$
    if received $\Delta\overline{x}_s$, $\Delta\overline{g}_s$ from local node s: **then**
      $\overline{x} \leftarrow \overline{x} + \alpha\Delta\overline{x}_s$, $\overline{g} \leftarrow \overline{g} + \alpha\Delta\overline{g}_s$
    end if
  end if
end while

4.1.1 Convergence Analysis

In this section, we provide a linear convergence bound for *ParamServ VR-lite*. Due to the asynchronous nature of the algorithm, the iterate x on which the gradient was evaluated might not be the same as the iterate on the central server when the local node sends

back the gradients evaluated. We use $D(k)$ to denote the particular iteration used to update the iterate in the k-th iteration. We assume that this delay is upper-bounded by a non-negative integer τ: $k - D(k) \leq \tau$. We also assume sparsity in the data matrix with $\Delta \ll 1$, where Δ denotes the average frequency with which a feature appears in the data matrix. We now present our main convergence result. For the analysis, we assume that data indices are chosen uniformly at random at each step.

Theorem 2. *Consider the minimization of a function* (1) *satisfying properties* (5) *and* (6)*. Consider the iterates generated by Algorithm 1. Let*

$$\alpha = 2 + 2npL(3\eta\mu + 3L\eta + 4\gamma\mu + 4L\gamma),$$
$$\beta = 2(\eta\mu - \eta - 8L\gamma),$$
$$\gamma = 2(\eta^2 + L\Delta\tau^2\eta^3)/(1 - 2L^2\Delta\eta^2\tau^2),$$

and assume η is sufficiently small and np and μ are sufficiently large such that $\beta > 0$ and $\alpha/(np\beta) < 1$. We have the bound

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_{m+1})} - f(x^\star)\Big] \leq \frac{\alpha}{np\beta}\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big] + \frac{\mu(3\eta + 8\gamma)}{\beta}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big].$$

where $\overline{f(x_m)} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_j f(x_m^j)$ denotes the average of the function values over the m-th epoch.

Proof. Due to space constraints, the proof is relegated to the supplementary material. In this proof, we use results from Theorem 1 and follow the model of the proof of Theorem 2 in [14], to derive a linear convergence bound. □

4.2 Avoiding Communication Bottlenecks

In a parameter server model of computation, each update to the parameter vector requires a communication phase between the central server and one of the local nodes. Ideally, we would like to decrease the frequency of (slow) communication with the central server so as to not impede (fast) gradient updates on each local node. This is achieved by updating *local* copies of x on each remote client, and communicating with the central server periodically to report the change. Furthermore, the same average gradient term will be shared across all local nodes and used for VR, ensuring that no local node drifts far away from the global solution even when communication gaps are large. This approach leads to a synchronous algorithm, *Sync VR-lite*, detailed in Algorithm 3.

We see that with this algorithm, each local node communicates with the central server only once for every n iterations. Thus, during a full epoch over the whole dataset, *Sync VR-lite* only requires a total of p communications with the central server, compared to pn communications in *ParamServ VR-lite*.

Algorithm 3 Sync VR-lite Algorithm

parameters learning rate η
initialize x, $\overline{x}$, $\overline{g}$
while not converged **do**
  for each local node **do**
    $\widetilde{x} = \widetilde{g} = 0$
    for k in $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ **do**
      random $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ without replacement
      $x = x - \eta\big(\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(\overline{x}) + \overline{g}\big)$
      $\widetilde{x} = \widetilde{x} + x$, $\widetilde{g} = \widetilde{g} + \nabla f_i(x)$
    end for
    $\overline{x}_s = \widetilde{x}/n$, $\overline{g}_s = \widetilde{g}/n$
    send x, $\overline{x}_s$, $\overline{g}_s$ to central node
    receive updated x, $\overline{x}$, $\overline{g}$ from central node
  end for
  central node:
    average x, $\overline{x}_s$, $\overline{g}_s$ received from worker s
    broadcast averaged x, $\overline{x}$, $\overline{g}$ to local workers
end while

This algorithm can also be made asynchronous very easily, as demonstrated in Algorithm 4. The key idea for the asynchronous algorithm, *Async VR-lite*, is similar to *ParamServ VR-lite*, in that only the change in the local parameter values x, the mark $\overline{x}_s$ and average gradient $\overline{g}_s$, are sent from worker s to the central server. This ensures that when updating the centrally stored x, $\overline{x}$, and $\overline{g}$, the previous contribution to the average from that local worker is subtracted out before adding in the new value. This is critical for ensuring that a fast working local node does not bias the solution, making the algorithm more robust to heterogeneous computing environments where local nodes work at drastically different speeds.

5 Results

In this section, we present our empirical results. We test our algorithms on a binary classification problem with L_2-regularized logistic regression and L_2-regularized linear regression (ridge regression) problems. More formally, we are interested in the following two optimization problems:

$$\min_x \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log\left(1 + \exp(b_i a_i^T x)\right) + \lambda\|x\|^2, \text{ and}$$
$$\min_x \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(a_i^T x - b_i)^2 + \lambda\|x\|^2,$$

Algorithm 4 Async VR-lite Algorithm

parameters learning rate η
initialize x, $\overline{x}, \overline{g}, \alpha = 1/p, x_{\text{old}} = \overline{x}_{\text{old}} = \overline{g}_{\text{old}} = 0$
while not converged **do**
  for each local node **do**
    $\widetilde{x} = \widetilde{g} = 0$
    for k in $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ **do**
      random $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ without replacement
      $x = x - \eta\big(\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(\overline{x}) + \overline{g}\big)$
      $\widetilde{x} = \widetilde{x} + x$, $\widetilde{g} = \widetilde{g} + \nabla f_i(x)$
    end for
    $\overline{x} = \widetilde{x}/n$, $\overline{g} = \widetilde{g}/n$
    $\Delta x = x - x_{\text{old}}$, $\Delta\overline{x} = \overline{x} - \overline{x}_{\text{old}}$, $\Delta\overline{g} = \overline{g} - \overline{g}_{\text{old}}$
    $\overline{x}_{\text{old}} = \overline{x}$, $\overline{g}_{\text{old}} = \overline{g}$
    send Δx, $\Delta\overline{x}$, $\Delta\overline{g}$ to central node
    receive updated x, $\overline{x}$, $\overline{g}$ from central node
  end for
  central node:
    receive Δx, $\Delta\overline{x}$, $\Delta\overline{g}$ from a local worker
    $x = x + \alpha\Delta x$, $\overline{x} = \overline{x} + \alpha\Delta\overline{x}$, $\overline{g} = \overline{g} + \alpha\Delta\overline{g}$
    send new x, $\overline{x}$, $\overline{g}$ back to local worker
end while

where each $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a data sample with label $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In all our experiments, we set the L_2 regularization parameter at $\lambda = 10^{-4}$.

5.1 Sequential Results

We first investigate the performance of *VR-lite* in the sequential, non-distributed setting. It is well-established by now that VR methods out-perform regular SGD by a wide margin. Thus, we compare our algorithm's performance to the two most popular variance reduction methods, SVRG [7] and SAGA [5].

We tested our method on two randomly generated toy datasets as well as two real world datasets. For the binary classification problem, we generated a random Gaussian data matrix for each class. The first class has zero mean while the second class has mean 1 entries. The variance of the distributions were varied such that the dataset was not perfectly linearly separable. For the ridge regression problem, we generated a random Gaussian matrix A and the observation vector is $b = Ax + \epsilon$, where ϵ is standard Gaussian noise. We built the toy datasets to have $n = 5000$ data samples with $d = 20$ features, with 2500 points of each class for the binary classification case. We also tested our method on two standard real world datasets: IJCNN1 [12] for binary classification and the MILLIONSONG [2] dataset for least squares regression.

Figure 1 shows results of our experiments. For all algorithms, we pick the constant learning rate which gives convergence in the least number of iterations. Convergence is said to occur when the gradient falls below 10^{-11}. Since a gradient computation is the most expensive step of these variance reduction methods, we plot the norm of the gradient on the y-axis with the number of gradient computations (divided by the number of data points in the data set) on the x-axis. It is important to note that comparing *VR-lite* and SVRG to SAGA may not be a fair comparison since SAGA requires a storage space of the size of the data set. Despite this fact, we find that *VR-lite* converges much faster than both SAGA and SVRG in all cases, requiring only about half the gradient computations of SVRG or SAGA.

5.2 Distributed Results

In this subsection, we present results of our distributed algorithms. All algorithms were implemented using Python and MPI, and run on a HPC cluster with 20 cores per node. We compare our algorithms to the following popular asynchronous stochastic optimization methods:

- Hogwild!: This is a basic asynchronous variant of SGD [13] using a "parameter server" model.
- Elastic Averaging SGD (EASGD): This is a recent asynchronous distributed SGD method [20] that has been shown to accelerate the training process of deep neural networks efficiently. We found the basic EASGD algorithm performed better than the momentum method (M-EASGD), so we present results only on EASGD. As recommended in [20], we set the parameter $\beta = 0.9$. Performance was nearly constant when the communication period was varied as $\tau = 1, 4, 16, 64$, so we present results only for $\tau = 16$.
- Asynchronous SVRG: This is the first work to our knowledge to propose an asynchronous variant of the variance reduction algorithms [14]. The authors show that the asynchronous SVRG algorithm enjoys the same benefits as its sequential counterpart over standard distributed stochastic optimization methods. As recommended in both [7] and [14], we set the epoch size to $2n$.

For all our experiments, we present results using the constant step size value that achieves fastest convergence. The iteration is stopped when the relative norm of the gradient (norm of the gradient on the current iteration divided by the norm of the gradient on the first iteration) falls below 10^{-5}. For *ParamServ VR-lite*, we synchronize workers after np iterations (where each local machine has n data points and there are p local



Figure 1: Sequential Results. Logistic regression on toy dataset; Ridge regression on toy data; Logistic regression on IJCNN1 dataset; Ridge regression on MILLIONSONG dataset



Figure 2: Distributed Results [Async VR-lite, Sync VR-lite and ParamServ VR-lite are the three distributed algorithms proposed in this paper]. Logistic regression and ridge regression on toy data set over 10 local workers; Time required for convergence as number of local workers is increased (data on each local worker is the same, i.e., data scales up linearly with the number of local workers) for logistic regression and ridge regression. Time taken should be constant for algorithms which scale up linearly with number of local workers.

workers) to ensure that the fastest worker does not run significantly faster than the slowest worker. This synchronization step is built into the asynchronous SVRG algorithm, since a full gradient needs to be computed after an epoch. No such synchronization step is required for *Async VR-lite*.

We present results on toy datasets to compare the distributed algorithms for both binary classification and least squares regression. The dataset on each local worker is generated as in the sequential case. We create a dataset with $n = 5000$ data samples and $d = 1000$ features on each local worker.

Figure 2 shows results of our distributed experiments. The first two plots compare our algorithms with the other methods. We plot the relative norm of the gradient on the y-axis, and wall clock time on the x-axis. For both the binary classification and least squares regression problems, we see that *ParamServ VR-lite* converges faster than the asynchronous SVRG methods, while the delayed-communication algorithms (both *Sync VR-lite* and *Async VR-lite*) are much faster than all other algorithms due to the lower number of communications with the central server.

The last two plots in Figure 2 show the scalability of our algorithms. We plot the wall clock time required for convergence on the y-axis and increase the number of local workers on the x-axis. In this case, each local worker has $n = 5000$ data points, i.e., the total amount of data scales linearly with the number of local workers. We notice that while the rate of convergence is erratic for *ParamServ VR-lite*, the general synchronous and asynchronous versions (*Sync VR-lite* and *Async VR-lite*) take approximately a constant amount of time as we increase the number of local workers. Thus, *Sync VR-lite* and *Async VR-lite* scale linearly with the number of local workers.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented *VR-lite*, a variance reduced SGD algorithm which does not require any full gradient computations or any extra storage requirements, as current variance reduced SGD methods do. We presented distributed variants of this algorithm for both a parameter server model of computation (*ParamServ VR-lite*), as well as for a setting with lower frequency of communication between the local nodes and the central server (*Sync VR-lite* and *Async VR-lite*). *Sync VR-lite* and *Async VR-lite* enjoy a linear speedup with the number of local workers. All proposed algorithms were shown to significantly out-perform existing state-of-the-art algorithms in settings typically encountered in machine learning.

For future work, it would be interesting to study how large these distributed algorithms can scale up to. It would also be very interesting to study whether these distributed asynchronous algorithms can provide any benefits when training non-convex models, and more

specifically, when training deep neural networks.

References

[1] Alekh Agarwal and John C Duchi. Distributed delayed stochastic optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 873–881, 2011.

[2] Thierry Bertin-Mahieux, Daniel P.W. Ellis, Brian Whitman, and Paul Lamere. The million song dataset. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR 2011)*, 2011.

[3] Dimitri P Bertsekas and John N Tsitsiklis. *Parallel and distributed computation: numerical methods*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1989.

[4] Jeffrey Dean, Greg Corrado, Rajat Monga, Kai Chen, Matthieu Devin, Mark Mao, Andrew Senior, Paul Tucker, Ke Yang, Quoc V Le, et al. Large scale distributed deep networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1223–1231, 2012.

[5] Aaron Defazio, Francis Bach, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. Saga: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1646–1654, 2014.

[6] Aaron J Defazio, Tibério S Caetano, and Justin Domke. Finito: A faster, permutable incremental gradient method for big data problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.2710*, 2014.

[7] Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 315–323, 2013.

[8] Jakub Konečnỳ, Jie Liu, Peter Richtárik, and Martin Takáč. ms2gd: Mini-batch semi-stochastic gradient descent in the proximal setting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.4744*, 2014.

[9] Jakub Konečnỳ and Peter Richtárik. Semi-stochastic gradient descent methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.1666*, 2013.

[10] John Langford, Alexander Smola, and Martin Zinkevich. Slow learners are fast. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0911.0491*, 2009.

[11] Mu Li, David G Andersen, Alex J Smola, and Kai Yu. Communication efficient distributed machine learning with the parameter server. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 19–27, 2014.

[12] Danil Prokhorov. Ijcnn 2001 neural network competition. *Slide presentation in IJCNN*, 1, 2001.

[13] Benjamin Recht, Christopher Re, Stephen Wright, and Feng Niu. Hogwild: A lock-free approach to parallelizing stochastic gradient descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 693–701, 2011.

[14] Sashank J Reddi, Ahmed Hefny, Suvrit Sra, Barnabás Póczos, and Alex Smola. On variance reduction in stochastic gradient descent and its asynchronous variants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.06840*, 2015.

[15] Herbert Robbins and Sutton Monro. A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 400–407, 1951.

[16] Mark Schmidt, Nicolas Le Roux, and Francis Bach. Minimizing finite sums with the stochastic average gradient. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1309.2388*, 2013.

[17] Ohad Shamir and Nathan Srebro. Distributed stochastic optimization and learning. In *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2014 52nd Annual Allerton Conference on*, pages 850–857. IEEE, 2014.

[18] Chong Wang, Xi Chen, Alex J Smola, and Eric P Xing. Variance reduction for stochastic gradient optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 181–189, 2013.

[19] Lin Xiao and Tong Zhang. A proximal stochastic gradient method with progressive variance reduction. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(4):2057–2075, 2014.

[20] Sixin Zhang, Anna Choromanska, and Yann LeCun. Deep learning with elastic averaging sgd. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6651*, 2014.

[21] Martin Zinkevich, Markus Weimer, Lihong Li, and Alex J Smola. Parallelized stochastic gradient descent. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2595–2603, 2010.

Supplementary Material

A Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Let the present epoch be $m+1$. We define the following:

$$u_{m+1}^k = -\Big[\nabla f_{i_k}\big(x_{m+1}^{D(k)}\big) - \nabla f_{i_k}(\bar{x}_m) + \overline{g}_m\Big]$$
$$v_{m+1}^k = -\Big[\nabla f_{i_k}\big(x_{m+1}^{k}\big) - \nabla f_{i_k}(\bar{x}_m) + \overline{g}_m\Big].$$

Thus the update rule is given by: $x_{m+1}^{k+1} = x_{m+1}^k - \eta u_{m+1}^k$.

We have the following:

$$\mathbb{E}\|x_{m+1}^{k+1} - x^\star\|^2 = \mathbb{E}\|x_{m+1}^k + \eta u_{m+1}^k - x^\star\|^2 = \mathbb{E}\Big[\|x_{m+1}^k - x^\star\|^2 + 2\eta(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star)^T u_{m+1}^k + \eta^2\|u_{m+1}^k\|^2\Big]. \quad (14)$$

We first bound the inner product term:

$$\mathbb{E}\big[(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star)^T u_{m+1}^k\big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[(x^\star - x_{m+1}^k)^T \nabla f_{i_k}\big(x_{m+1}^{D(k)}\big)\Big] + \mathbb{E}\Big[(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star)^T(\nabla f(\bar{x}_m) - \overline{g}_m)\Big]. \quad (15)$$

From the proof of Theorem 2 in [14], we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big[(x^\star - x_{m+1}^k)^T \nabla f_{i_k}\big(x_{m+1}^{D(k)}\big)\Big] &\le \mathbb{E}\Big[f(x^\star) - f(x_{m+1}^k) + \frac{L\Delta\tau}{2}\sum_{d=D(k)}^{k-1}\big\|x_{m+1}^{d+1} - x_{m+1}^d\big\|^2\Big] \\ &\le \mathbb{E}\Big[f(x^\star) - f(x_{m+1}^k) + \frac{L\Delta\tau\eta^2}{2}\sum_{d=D(k)}^{k-1}\big\|u_{m+1}^d\big\|^2\Big].\end{aligned}$$

From the proof of Theorem 2 in [14], we also get:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{np}\mathbb{E}\Big[\|u_{m+1}^k\|^2\Big] \le \frac{2}{(1-2L^2\Delta\eta^2\tau^2)}\sum_{k=1}^{np}\mathbb{E}\Big[\|v_{m+1}^k\|^2\Big]$$

Summing (14) over all k in the $(m+1)$-th epoch:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big[\|x_{m+2}^0 - x^\star\|^2\Big] &\le \mathbb{E}\Big[\|x_{m+1}^0 - x^\star\|^2 + (\eta^2 + L\Delta\tau^2\eta^3)\sum_{k=1}^{np}\|u_{m+1}^k\|^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{np}2\eta\big(f(x_{m+1}^k) - f(x^\star)\big)\Big] \\ &\quad + 2\eta\sum_{k=1}^{np}\mathbb{E}\Big[(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star)^T(\nabla f(\bar{x}_m) - \overline{g}_m)\Big] \\ &\le \mathbb{E}\Big[\|x_{m+1}^0 - x^\star\|^2 + 2\Big(\frac{\eta^2 + L\Delta\tau^2\eta^3}{1-2L^2\Delta\eta^2\tau^2}\Big)\sum_{k=1}^{np}\|v_{m+1}^k\|^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{np}2\eta\big(f(x_{m+1}^k) - f(x^\star)\big)\Big] \\ &\quad + 2\eta\sum_{k=1}^{np}\mathbb{E}\Big[(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star)^T(\nabla f(\bar{x}_m) - \overline{g}_m)\Big]. \quad (16)\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $\mathbb{E}\Big[\|x_{m+2}^0 - x^\star\|^2\Big] \ge 0$, and putting in $\overline{f(x_m)} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_j f(x_m^j)$, we get

$$2np\eta\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_{m+1})} - f(x^\star)\Big] \le \mathbb{E}\Big[\|x_{m+1}^0 - x^\star\|^2 + 2\Big(\frac{\eta^2 + L\Delta\tau^2\eta^3}{1-2L^2\Delta\eta^2\tau^2}\Big)\sum_{k=1}^{np}\|v_{m+1}^k\|^2\Big]$$

$$+ 2\eta \sum_{k=1}^{np} \mathbb{E}\Big[(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star)^T (\nabla f(\bar{x}_m) - \overline{g}_m)\Big]. \tag{17}$$

From Theorem 1, we get:

$$2\eta \sum_{k=1}^{np} \mathbb{E}\Big[(x_{m+1}^k - x^\star)^T (\nabla f(\bar{x}_m) - \overline{g}_m)\Big] \leq \frac{2np\eta}{\mu} \mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_{m+1})} - f(x^\star)\Big] + np\eta(6L + 6L^2/\mu)\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big]$$
$$+ 3np\eta\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big]. \tag{18}$$

From Theorem 1, we also have:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|v_{m+1}^k\big\|^2\Big] \leq \mathbb{E}\Big[8L\Big(f(x_{m+1}^k) - f(x^\star)\Big) + (8L + 8L^2/\mu)\Big(\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big) + 4\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big]. \tag{19}$$

From Theorem 1, we also get:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\big\|x_{m+1}^0 - x^\star\big\|^2\Big] \leq \frac{2}{\mu}\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big]. \tag{20}$$

Combining (18), (19) and (20) into (17) and writing $\gamma = 2(\eta^2 + L\Delta\tau^2\eta^3)/(1 - 2L^2\Delta\eta^2\tau^2)$, we get:

$$\beta\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_{m+1})} - f(x^\star)\Big] \leq \frac{\alpha}{np}\mathbb{E}\Big[\overline{f(x_m)} - f(x^\star)\Big] + \mu(3\eta + 8\gamma)\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \nabla f_{i_j}(x^\star)\Big\|^2\Big],$$

where:

$$\beta = 2(\eta\mu - \eta - 8L\gamma), \tag{21}$$
$$\alpha = 2 + 2npL(3\eta\mu + 3L\eta + 4\gamma\mu + 4L\gamma. \tag{22}$$

The result immediately follows.

□